IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Holger STENZEL — Examiner: Magali P. Slawski

Serial No.: 10/593,060 — Group Art Unit: 1728

Filed: July 23, 2008

Title: PROCESS FOR THE COEXTRUSION OF MELT STREAMS OF DIFFERENT COMPOSITION

REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.41

MAIL STOP: APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer issued December 7, 2010, Appellants submit the following Reply Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.41.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Esposito et al. and Knaus are significantly different processes

At pages 14-15 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner argues that the processes of Esposito et al. and Knaus are related in that both deal with extrusion of two different colored materials. However, appellants submit that these processes are significantly different such that one of ordinary skill in the art seeking to modify the process of Esposito et al. would not look to the process of Knaus.

Esposito et al. is directed to a process for making a transparent film having a tinted region, in particular a film based polyvinyl butyral. One skilled in the art when seeking to

modify such a process would look to other processes for making colored transparent film. But, Knaus is directed to making colored **foam** products. Since foaming would adversely impact the transparency of any resultant product, one skilled in the art would not look to production of foam products when considering modification of a processes for making tinted transparent films.

Furthermore, the process of Esposito et al. is designed for use with a slit die so that a flat sheet is extruded. Knaus, on the other hand, uses an annular die to extrude a tube. Clearly, the flow characteristics of polymer melts through these dies are significantly different. Therefore, one skilled in the art seeking to modify the flow of polymer melt to and through a slit die would not like to a processes that involves the use of an annular die.

In view of the above remarks and the remarks presented in Appellants' Appeal Brief, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of Esposito et al. (US '868), taken alone or in view of the disclosure of Knaus (US '706) and/or Schuchardt (US 2002/0067656) and/or and Postavnichev et al. (US 4,096,069) and/or the article by Chung, fails to render obvious appellants' claimed invention. Reversal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brion P. Heaney/

Brion P. Heaney
Registration No. 32,542

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: KURARAY-0013

Date: February 7, 2011

BPH:dap